

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 37-41, 43-52 and 69.

Entry of Amendment

As Applicants are filing a RCE herewith, this amendment and the accompanying IDS should be entered and considered by the Examiner at this time.

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's remaining rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-5, 8, 10-15, 53-57, 59, 61-67 and 70

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 8, 10-15, 53-57, 59, 61-67 and 70 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada (US 6,114,715) in view of Friend et al. (US 6,518,700). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1 and 53 to recite the feature of "wherein the organic resin layer comprises a top surface and a side surface, the side surface being tapered." This feature is supported by, for example, at least Fig. 1A and page 15, line 23 - page 16, line 1 of the specification of the present application.

In contrast, neither Hamada nor Friend disclose or suggest the side surface of the organic resin layer of the claimed device being tapered.

Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 53 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 1 and 53 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 60

The Examiner also rejects Claims 9 and 60 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Oda et al. (US 6,396,208). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10-15, 53-54, 56-57, 59 and 61-66

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10-15, 53-54, 56-57, 59 and 61-66 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend and further in view of Iwase et al. (US 6,768,534). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1 and 53 to recite the feature of “wherein the organic resin layer comprises a top surface and a side surface, the side surface being tapered.”

In contrast, none of the cited references disclose or suggest the side surface of the organic resin layer of the claimed device being tapered.

Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 53 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 1 and 53 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 60

The Examiner also rejects Claims 9 and 60 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Iwase in view of Oda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 8 and 10-15

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-5, 8 and 10-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Kaneda et al. (JP 2000-269473). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite the feature of “wherein the organic resin layer comprises a top surface and a side surface, the side surface being tapered.”

In contrast, none of the cited references disclose or suggest the side surface of the organic resin layer of the claimed device being tapered.

Therefore, independent Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 9

The Examiner also rejects Claim 9 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Kaneda in view of Oda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 23-27, 29, 31-36 and 68

The Examiner also rejects Claims 23-27, 29, 31-36 and 68 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Kaneda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 23 to recite the feature of “wherein the organic resin layer comprises a top surface and a side surface, the side surface being tapered.”

In contrast, none of the cited references disclose or suggest the side surface of the organic resin layer of the claimed device being tapered.

Therefore, independent Claim 23 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 23 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 30

The Examiner also rejects Claim 30 under 35 USC §103(a)as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Kaneda in view of Oda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered at this time and prior to the issuance of any further action for this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee is due for this amendment, the IDS, and/or the RCE, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: July 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568